



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner informed Mr. Foster that the response filed 16 September 2003 was non-responsive to the obviousness-type double patenting rejection. The examiner asked Mr. Foster if Applicant would consider submitting a Supplemental Response to avoid the Office's mailing of a non-responsive letter. Mr. Foster stated that a Supplemental Response would be submitted would be mailed to applicant..